



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,856	10/29/2003	Arup Acharya	YOR920030443US1 (163-18)	7848
24336 7590 11/28/2007 KEUSEY, TUTUNJIAN & BITETTO, P.C. 20 CROSSWAYS PARK NORTH SUITE 210 WOODBURY, NY 11797			EXAMINER TIEU, BINH KIEN	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/695,856

Applicant(s)

ACHARYA ET AL.

Examiner

/BINH K. TIEU/

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent-term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23-31 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-7, 11, 13-17 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinfeldt et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0187992 *as cited in the previous Office Action*) in view of Marquette et al (Pub No.: US 2002/0156900).

Regarding claim 1, Steinfeldt et al. ("Steinfeldt") teaches method for enabling voice over Internet for computer applications, comprising the steps of

registering session initiation protocol (SIP) as a system service (paragraphs [0018], [0096], [0171]);

providing SIP service through an application programming interface (API) to permit access to service functions by individual software applications (paragraph [0020]-[0021]);

providing a SIP link within a software application to permit user invocation of SIP service functions (paragraph [0099]); and

passing the link as a parameter to permit external access to an invoked service function (paragraphs [0101], [0110]-[0114], and also see example in paragraphs [0182]-[0200]).

It should be noticed that Steinfeldt fails to clearly teach the features of enabling and providing voice over internet service within the software application, as amended and argued by the Application. However, Marquette et al. ("Marquette") teaches such features in paragraphs [0057]-[0058], [001]-[0075] and [0121]-[0122] for a purpose of providing voice over Internet services included voice recognition service, text-to-speech service, etc. to clients over the Internet.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of enabling and providing voice over internet service within the software application, as amended and argued by the Application, as taught by Marquette, into view of Steinfeldt in order to provide voice over Internet services included voice recognition service, text-to-speech service, etc. to clients over the Internet.

Regarding claim 2, Steinfeldt further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraph [0139].

Regarding claims 3-4, Steinfeldt further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0096]-[0097].

Regarding claims 5-6, Steinfeldt further teaches limitations of the claims in paragraphs [0171] and [0180].

Regarding claim 7, Steinfeldt further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraphs [0015]-[0017] and [0099].

Regarding claim 11, Steinfeldt further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraph [0059]-[0072].

Regarding claim 13, Steinfeldt teaches a method for enabling voice over Internet for computer applications, comprising the steps of

registering session initiation protocol (SIP) as a system service (paragraphs [0018], [0096], [0171]);

providing SIP service through an application programming interface (API) to permit access to service functions by individual software applications (paragraph [0020]-[0021]) by recognizing SIP links within a software application and highlighting the SIP link in a user interface of the application to permit user to select the SIP link (paragraph [0099]); and

passing the link as a parameter to permit external access to an invoked service function (paragraphs [0101], [0110]-[0114], and also see example in paragraphs [0182]-[0200]).

It should be noticed that Steinfeldt fails to clearly teach the features of enabling and providing voice over internet service within the software application, as amended and argued by the Application. However, Marquette teaches such features in paragraphs [0057]-[0058], [001]-[0075] and [0121]-[0122] for a purpose of providing voice over Internet services included voice recognition service, text-to-speech service, etc. to clients over the Internet.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of enabling and providing voice over internet service within the software application, as amended and argued by the Application, as taught by Marquette, into view of Steinfeldt in order to provide voice over Internet services included voice recognition service, text-to-speech service, etc. to clients over the Internet.

Regarding claim 14, Steinfeldt further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraph [0139].

Regarding claims 15-16, Steinfeldt further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraphs [0096]-[0097].

Regarding claim 17, Steinfeldt further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraphs [0015]-[0017] and [0099].

Regarding claim 21, Steinfeldt further teaches limitations of the claim in paragraph [0059]-[0072].

Regarding claim 22, Steinfeldt teaches a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform method steps for enabling voice over Internet for computer applications, the method steps comprising registering session initiation protocol (SIP) as a system service (paragraphs [0018], [0096], [0171]);

providing SIP service through an application programming interface (API) to permit access to service functions by individual software applications (paragraph [0020]-[0021]) by recognizing SIP links within a software application and highlighting the SIP link in a user interface of the application to permit user to select the SIP link (paragraph [0099]); and

passing the link as a parameter to permit external access to an invoked service function (paragraphs [0101], [0110]-[0114], and also see example in paragraphs [0182]-[0200]).

It should be noticed that Steinfeldt fails to clearly teach the features of enabling and providing voice over internet service within the software application, as amended and argued by the Application. However, Marquette teaches such features in paragraphs [0057]-[0058], [001]-[0075] and [0121]-[0122] for a purpose of providing voice over Internet services included voice recognition service, text-to-speech service, etc. to clients over the Internet.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of enabling and providing voice over internet service within the software application, as amended and argued by the Application, as taught by Marquette, into view of Steinfeldt in order to provide voice over Internet services included voice recognition service, text-to-speech service, etc. to clients over the Internet.

3. Claims 8-10 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinfeldt et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0187992) Marquette et al (Pub No.: US 2002/0156900) as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Goroshevsky et al. (Pub. No.: US 2005/0036482 *as cited in the previous Office Action*).

Regarding claims 8-10 and 18-20, Steinfeldt and Marquette, in combination, teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the features of steps of initiating a conference call by passing the SIP link to other parties to joint the conference all. However, Goroshevsky et al. ("Goroshevsky") teaches such features in paragraphs [0125]-[0126] for a purpose of permitting other participants to join the conference.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of steps of initiating a conference call by passing the SIP link to other parties to join the conference call, as taught by Goroshevsky, into view of Steinfeldt and Marquette in order to allow other participants to join the conference.

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinfeldt et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0187992) Marquette et al (Pub No.: US 2002/0156900) as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Lund (US Pat. #: 6,370,137 *as cited in the previous Office Action*).

Regarding claim 12, Steinfeldt and Marquette, in combination, teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the features of setting up a common web page to set up a voice conference with a plurality of users. However, Lund teaches such features in col.8, lines 36-59 for a purpose of automatically providing virtual communication paths among parties in a conferencing service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of setting up a common web page to set up a voice conference with a plurality of users, as taught by Lund, into view of Steinfeldt and Marquette in order to improve conferencing service over VoIP calls.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 23-31 are allowed.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to clearly teach or fairly suggest the feature of a SIP wrapper, which based on user input, passes control to either the client or the soft-phone in a system for providing a session initiation protocol (SIP) service on a client machine, as substantially connected and described in the independent claim 23.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231**

Or faxed to:

**(703) 872-9314 or (571) 273-8300 (for formal communications; please
"EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")**

mark

Or:

**If it is an informal or draft communication, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")**

Hand Carry Deliveries to:

**Customer Service Window
(Randolph Building)
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314**

Application/Control Number:
10/695,856
Art Unit: 2614

Page 9

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh K. Tieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7510 and E-mail address: BINH.TIEU@USPTO.GOV.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (571) 272-7499 and **IF PAPER HAS BEEN MISSED FROM THIS OFFICIAL ACTION PACKAGE, PLEASE CALL CUSTOMER SERVICE FOR THE SUBSTITUTIONS OR COPIES.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the FAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BINH K. TIEU/
Primary Examiner
Technology Division 2614

Date: November 2007